

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed September 05, 2007.

By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2 and to address the claim objection outlined in item 2 of the Office Action. Thus, in view of the amendments to claim 1, claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to its underlying subject matter. Thus, claims 1 and 3-5 are currently pending in this application. Support for the claim amendments can be readily found variously throughout the specification and the original claims.

In view of these amendments, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Claims

Claim 1-5 are objected to for insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the radiation detecting means" in lines 12 and 18 of claim 1. Applicant believes that the objections to claims 1-5 has been overcome in view of the Applicant's amendment to claim 1 which provides proper antecedent basis for the noted limitation. Thus, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as anticipated by Hsieh (U.S. Patent No: 5,249,123) in view of Roos et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,041,097). This rejection has been rendered moot by the incorporation of claim 2 into claim 1.

Rejections under Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 1 and 2 rejected or provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over (A) claims 11 and 15 of U.S. Patent No. 7,006,599, (B) claims 2 and 5 of copending application number 10/887,920, (C) claims 5 and 6 of copending application number 10/901,212, (D) claims 3 and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 7,073,941, (E)

claims 5 and 7 of copending application number 11/061,783, and (F) claims 2 and 6 of copending application number 11/654,506. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. However, in the interest of expediting the allowance of the present application, Applicant has submitted herewith terminal disclaimers in accordance with U.S. practice. Thus, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are believed to be clearly patentable over the outstanding rejections. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the claims in light of the above remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Dated: December 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Lee Cheng

Registration No.: 40,949

CHENG LAW GROUP PLLC

1100 17th Street, N.W.

Suite 503

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 530-1280

Attorneys for Applicant

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-4422 for any such fees; and applicant(s) hereby petition for any needed extension of time.